



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
RESEARCH EXECUTIVE AGENCY

Director

Brussels,

REVIEW REPORT

Grant Agreement (GA) number:	693857
Project¹ Acronym:	TRACES
Project title:	Transmitting Contentious Cultural Heritages with the Arts: From Intervention to Co-Production
Type of Action:	RIA
Start date of the project:	01/03/2016
Duration of the project:	36
Name of the primary coordinator contact and organisation:	Klaus SCHÖNBERGER (UNI-KLU)
Period covered by the report:	from 01/03/2016 to 28/02/2017
Periodic report:	1st
Date of first submission of the periodic report (if applicable):	02/05/2017
Date of latest version of Annex 1 to the GA (Description of the Action - DoA) against which the assessment is performed	15/03/2016
Date of meeting with consortium (if applicable):	18/05/2017
Name(s) of monitors assisting in the project assessment (if applicable)	ALINA IOANA BRANDA PETER ARONSSON
Name of Project Officer drafting the report:	Hinano SPREAFICO

¹ The term ‘project’ used in this template equates to an ‘action’ in certain other Horizon 2020 documentation

1. Overall assessment

Overall assessment
Project has fully achieved its objectives and milestones for the period.
Significant results linked to dissemination, exploitation and impact potential
<p>Project will likely provide results with significant immediate or potential impact in the next reporting period (even if not all objectives mentioned in the Annex 1 to the GA were achieved).</p> <p>The project has through planned activities and actions achieved most of its objectives and planned results for the period, with relatively minor deviations.</p> <p>Innovative collaboration combining art and contentious heritage is explored through new methods designed to learn from this transgressing work method. All CCP have as art projects an outreach dimension at its centre, but is also systematic reflexive to be able to establish long term effect. The dissemination package is extensive and seems to work as planned. As most WPs run through the entire 3 year period the first year can not fully document the results.</p> <p>One of the most promising results so far is to create working methods between artist, scholars and heritage institutions across Europe. To learn from this and create tools and models to spread this is an important goal in itself since this provide a promising platform to do in-depth investigation and negotiation of difficulties and contentions in Europe.</p> <p>The ethical issues and challenges derived from the work within sensitive communities, focusing on traumatic topics are very well addressed in D.7.3, D8.1, D.8.3.. The report on ethical issues convincingly spelled out a list of ethical measures and challenges that should be considered in the framework of the project.</p> <p>The work on two open-access resources, a volume with still a working title and a manual are already in preparation and would be a good manner to deepen the debate on reflexive Europeanisation.</p> <p>Some of the involved concepts (reflexive Europeanisation, contentious cultural heritage, CCP-s etc), messages, materials presented could be simplified or explained in such ways that the diversification of the target audiences might have been achieved.</p> <p>Minor deviation in WP2 is due to difficulty to recruit students to work in the WP. WP3 turns with good arguments to a more acute timetable and a more grounded approach to study conflict education. WP4 has very diverse interventions and has had to postpone the fulfilment of a popular Opera due to artistic concern and seems to lack interaction with other WPs</p>
General comments
<p>Innovative collaboration combining art and contentious heritage is explored through new methods designed to learn from this transgressing work method. To learn from this and create tools and models to spread this is an important goal in itself since this provide a promising platform to do in-depth investigation and negotiation of difficulties and contentions in Europe.</p>
Recommendations concerning the period covered by the report
<p>All deliverables approved, resources used properly, communication and dissemination is on its way but can be fine tuned in communication plan</p>
Recommendations concerning future work, if applicable
<p>As the complex transdisciplinary and multi institutional interaction is at the heart of the project adequate measures to contextualize the used theoretical concepts, a process to refine the obtained knowledge and lastly means to disseminate these to meet the objectives has to be focused by the team the next year. A bit more in detail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The link between different CCP-s of the project should be made clearer. It is equally important to understand their specific meanings and particular goals but also to get an adequate sense of how and why they are correlated as such; simultaneously their contribution to the project as a whole should be emphasized: why and how do they contribute to reflexive Europeanisation; a good balance between the specific aims of particular activities carried out in the framework of the project and its general goals should be considered.- a conceptual refinement of the concept of contentious heritage is needed. It will then be both a tool to analyse the collaborations and an important result to bring about new capacities among cultural institutions in their skill to choose and negotiate difficult issues through heritage. Similar work might be needed for agonistic heritage as a goal. It needs to be contextualized, situated and localized into to work in the various settings presented by the WPs and CCPs.

- Tools and processes are identified to help gathering knowledge from the WP and CCP. However with such a rich material the capacity to author this needs to be boosted both by the theoretical work above and by an orchestrated and perhaps even authored leadership. This means a need to form a strong and small group to author and formulate of sharp conclusions relating to the main objective in addition to all the rich and nuanced observations made underway.

- A developed communication plan and an adapted language to address different audiences would be helpful. For example contentious heritage might outside academia be obstructive and even create contention in itself. Other concept like a more open prefix of “urgent” heritage might do the job better for some dissemination puposes. It would be relevant to integrate the work methods also to identify contentious heritage in need for creative interaction. It is not all that clear how the deliberation behind the selection of cases was reached. Contentious heritage is not only to be overcome. It might be even more important to identify scars still alive in the past but not realized as contentious heritage yet. That might be the case with the death mask. A terminology could be developed around the cases to identify and deal with explicit contentious, potential and perhaps unconscious. An overview of the interaction between ccp and wps in relation to expected main results would be helpful.

2. Objectives and Workplan

Is the progress reported in line with objectives and work plan as specified in the DoA? If there are significant deviations, please comment.	Yes
<p>As a whole the project works according to its plan. The activities planned in the WP1 WP2, W3, WP4, WP5 (the participatory questionnaire, the first collaborations with Italian museums, the action research based project, the field research on the art production, the attempt to extend the inventory beyond the case studies of the individual CCPs) are adequately described in the deliverables; they reflect this phase of the Action.</p> <p>WPs are conducted as reflexive and method developing actions through a series of five CCPs of various cooproductions around contentious heritage. Two methodological tools, a Questionnaire and Hybrid records are constructed to collect, stabilize and secure the results for future use. It is too early to assess if these are successful and comprehensive enough.</p>	
Are the objectives of the project still scientifically and /or technologically relevant?	Yes
<p>The project continues to be scientifically relevant, the idea of triggering and challenging reflexive Europeanisation is implicitly present in all projects actions; the multi- disciplinary and collaborative dimensions are central and very well expressed through artistic and scientific co productions; the methodology is well engaged. It is increasingly relevant to find active models for identifying and working with contentious heritage</p>	
Are the critical implementation risks and mitigation actions described in the DoA still relevant?	Yes
<p>The risks and mitigation actions described in the DoA are still relevant and should be considered as such. Those risks observed in working with the WPs that have resulted in well argued changes in the implementation to keep the main objectives relevant and within reach.</p>	
Have the pilots/case studies started to showcase innovative results as described in the DoA?	Yes
<p>The performances of CCPs are acting as pilots for the continued work. The case studies have started to showcase innovative results and there are good premises to achieve them further on.</p>	
Have the ethics related deliverables and/or requirements due for the current period been adequately addressed and approved?	Yes
<p>Several issues have been dealt with, an adequate ethical board has helped and continue to give advice. Because of the contentious matter caution is needed and upcoming ethical considerations can not be avoid. Working on highly sensitive topics, the unpredictable reactions/ responses are likely to appear, ethical associated issues should be carefully revised and contextually/specifically re-analyzed if needed. Especially consideration if the plan is to work with children must be taken.</p>	
Have the comments and recommendations from previous assessments been taken into account?	Not applicable
<p>not applicable</p>	

3. Impact

Does the work carried out contribute to the expected impacts detailed in the DoA?	Yes
<p>The project aims at developing new methods for cross-sectional interaction around difficult and contentious heritage. The development of networks, trust and methods to do so is well under way and the participants are well aware and well equipped to deal with the challenges met in this endeavour. An extensive package of dissemination tools have been set up and applied. Cross institutional interaction and learning is reported</p>	
Does the work carried out follow the plan detailed in the DoA to enhance innovation capacity, create new markets opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, address industrial and/or societal needs at regional level or bring other important benefits for society? Give information on the relevant innovation activities carried out (prototypes, testing activities, standards, clinical trials) and/or new product, service, reference materials, process or method (to be) launched to the market, if any.	Yes
<p>The activities carried out in the framework of the project are innovative: the way CCP-s are well thought and structured, the perspective on contentious cultural heritage, the educational materials already provided- all demonstrate the innovation capacities, being in line with the plan detailed in the DoA. New methods to deal with contentious heritage are much needed and being processed in the project. Results from the projects have the potential both to strengthen a sustainable society and contribute to tourism with new methods dealing with art, heritage and history in co-production</p>	
Does the work carried out contribute towards European policy objectives and strategies and have an impact on policy making?	Yes
<p>The work has potential to contribute to create trust, lower risk of conflict and work towards social and cultural sustainability</p>	
Does (or will) the work carried out have an impact on SMEs?	Partially
<p>Much work in the cultural sector engage small companies and has a potential to interact also with travel industry even if the main results are more long term and related to cultural sustainability. This is not yet reflected on by the team, but could be one way to gain innovative outreach. This issue is to be approached in a later stage of the project concerning the impact of the project for example on Drustvo za Domace Raziskave and Hosman Durabil involved in the project.</p>	
Have the beneficiaries aimed at a gender balance at all levels of personnel assigned to the action? If beneficiaries could not achieve the balanced participation of women and men in their teams despite active recruitment efforts, have the reasons been explained in the periodic report?	Yes
<p>the project reflects a good gender balance on all levels</p>	

4. Implementation

Has the project been efficiently and effectively managed?	Yes
The report deals meticulously with the complex work and any deviation is reported and dealt with accordingly. The Work Plans and Work Packages and the associated activities designed for this phase of the Action are adequately, efficiently and effectively managed according to the management plan in the DoA. Difficulties might appear due to the multidisciplinary profile of the project and its members, and will probably need interventions and solutions that should be contextually addressed. The interaction between WP and CCPs forms a matrix of great complexity and it will take good management to be able to make the most out of the results of both actions and methods to feed back into sustainable accumulation of knowledge and tools.	
Is the management of the project in line with the obligations of beneficiaries (including ethics and security requirements, risk and innovation management if applicable)?	Yes
The management of the project is in line with the obligations of beneficiaries, including ethics and security requirements risk and innovation management.	
Is the contribution of each beneficiary in line with the work committed in the DoA? (applicable only to multibeneficiary projects)	Yes
Beneficiaries contribute adequately to the WPs and CCPs proposed in the DoA. To secure maximum effect for the overall objectives management needs to focus on how actions relate to each other and how they are integrated in answering the overall project objectives. Oslo had difficulties in finding students to match the plan I WP 2.	
Have the beneficiaries disseminated project results (foreground) in scientific publications as planned in the DoA, including the deposition of publications in open access repositories? Has the dissemination plan been updated? Do they include a reference to EU funding?	Yes
Intensive and professional dissemination towards academic and professional communities on the progress and context of the projects. As this is the first year final results for dissemination are mostly yet to be presented	
Have the beneficiaries disseminated and communicated project activities and results by other means than scientific publications (social media, press-release, the project web site, video/film...) as planned in the DoA? Do they include a reference to EU funding?	Partially
The beneficiaries disseminated and communicated the project activities and results via social media, the project web site, magazine video documentation and other visual materials. More easy access information as well as more targeted and precise communication plan will help to fulfil the objectives	
Has the plan for exploitation of results, in particular as regards intellectual property rights, been appropriately planned and executed, as described in the DoA?	Not applicable
not applicable	
Has the dissemination and exploitation plan been appropriately executed and updated? Give details if an update of the D&E plan is needed.	Yes
The dissemination and exploitation plan is in line with the one mentioned in DoA, Annex 1. It considers adequately the planned time frames. As the project proceeds the complex learning and results needs effective and multi dimensional dissemination, hence the dissemination plan might need to be updated	
Has the Data Management Plan (DMP) been appropriately drafted and, if applicable, executed? Give details if an update of the DMP is needed.	Yes
The DMP has been appropriately drafted, approved and executed according to the time frames.	

Have the proposed institutional changes been appropriately promoted?	Not applicable
not applicable	

5. Resources

Were the resources used as described in the DoA and were they necessary to achieve its objectives? If there are deviations from planned budget, have they been satisfactorily explained? Have they been used in a manner consistent with the principle of sound financial management, in particular regarding economy, efficiency and effectiveness?	Yes
Resources has been used in accordance with the DoA. Where minor changes has been made, mainly within WP2, deviations has been satisfactory explained	

Annex 1 - Expert's opinion on deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Status	Comments
D2.1	Survey progress report	Accepted	Approved. Motivated change of plans due to difficulties to recruit students
D3.1	Report and material on approaches to education	Accepted	Approved
D4.4	Video documentation of participatory Opera in Dordolla	Accepted	approved
D4.5	Online-catalogue of Peć	Accepted	Approved
D6.1	Kick-off Meeting: summary report	Accepted	approved
D6.2	Basic dissemination tools	Accepted	approved
D6.3	TRACES Magazine	Accepted	approved
D7.2	Report on ethical issues	Accepted	Approved after adjustments
D7.3	Naming of Ethical Advisory board	Accepted	Approved after revision
D8.1	H - Requirement No. 1	Accepted	approved
D8.2	NEC - Requirement No. 3	Accepted	approved
D8.3	POPD - Requirement No. 2	Accepted	Approved after delay and revision

Annex 2 - Expert's opinion on milestones

Miles. no.	Milestone title	Achieved	Comments
MS1	Project launch	Yes	approved
MS6	UNIKUM projects and relating data collection finished	Yes	approved